

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in this application. Claim 18 is objected to as being a substantial duplicate of claim 20. Claims 1-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,385,552 (“Snyder”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Interview Summary

Applicants’ undersigned representative, Mr. Eiferman, and Examiners Emeka Ebirim and Shahid Alam participated in a telephonic interview on July 10, 2006 to discuss the present claim amendments. Examiners Emeka Ebirim and Shahid Alam stated that the above claim amendments appeared to overcome the rejections of record.

Claim Objections

Claim 18 is objected to as being a substantial duplicate of claim 20. Claim 18 is hereby amended to correct a typographical error such that it is no longer a duplicate of claim 20.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,385,552 (“Snyder”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

The claimed invention is directed to deploying a device database to a device for testing of the device. After being deployed to the device, the database is installed on the device according to a selected installation property. Claims 1 and 9 require that the selected installation property specify whether or not an existing version of the device database on the device should be overwritten by the deployed version of the device database. Claims 17 and 22 require that the selected installation property be one of an always overwrite property, an overwrite if different property, and a never overwrite property.

Snyder is directed to collecting test measurements. Snyder discloses that a testing program (“Test Executive”) may be downloaded to a testing component for testing other modules (Snyder, Col. 30, ll. 30-57). Snyder does not teach or suggest deploying a device database to a device ***that is being tested***. Moreover, Snyder does not teach or suggest

DOCKET NO.: 303661.01 / MSFT-2791
Application No.: 10/719,481
Office Action Dated: May 16, 2006

PATENT

installing the device database according to selected installation property that specifies whether or not an existing version of the device database on the device should be overwritten by the deployed version of the device database (claims 1 and 9). Additionally, Snyder does not teach or suggest installing the device database according to one of an always overwrite property, an overwrite if different property, and a never overwrite property (Claims 17 and 22).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 9, 17 and 22 are not anticipated by Snyder. Applicants further submit that claims 2-8, 10-16, 18-21 and 23-26 are patentable at least by reason of their dependency. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections are respectfully requested.

DOCKET NO.: 303661.01 / MSFT-2791
Application No.: 10/719,481
Office Action Dated: May 16, 2006

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Applicants further submit that no new matter has been added by the present amendment. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: August 16, 2006



Kenneth R. Eiferman
Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439